

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

63-1873

5 MAR 1963

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director/Support

SUBJECT : Involuntary Separation Allowance

REFERENCE : Memorandum for Executive Director from Director of Personnel, dated 11 February 1963, same subject

1. I have discussed this memorandum with the DDCI who concurs in the views expressed herein.

2. In regard to reference, I feel that we are remiss in not making every reasonable attempt to broaden the base of coverage of our ISA Program to include persons who will not be covered in our early retirement legislation. In this regard, I request that you draft a new policy position, in consultation with the General Counsel and others, that will include this broader coverage as well as provide for more liberal benefits that are presently authorized in Agency regulations.

3. I recognize that at this time it may not be appropriate to attempt to alter our proposed early retirement legislation. However, I object to the sense of the reference memorandum on several counts:

a. It is stated in paragraph 3 of reference, "Conversely, it was made clear that the Agency did not intend to authorize this benefit for personnel whose circumstances upon separation would be no different from those of the employee reduced in force from another Government agency. It was our view at the time that we would not be able to obtain concurrence in providing such a benefit distinguished from those of the regular civil service employee." The circumstances for employment for all employees in CIA is distinctly different from conditions in other US Government agencies. I believe that we put more demands on our people than is true in other Government agencies. Also the DCI has absolute authority to separate any employee of CIA at

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

any time for any reason without review by an external group. This is not true of Civil Service in the normal Government agency. These are only two instances in which the conditions of employment in the Agency are different from those in other agencies.

b. As you are aware, the military services have far more generous compensation than CIA for officers who are retired early at the convenience of the Government. It would seem that this establishes a precedent which we can follow.

c. In paragraph 3 of reference it states, "However, neither the Administration nor the Congress has to date proposed to go beyond offering regular unemployment compensation to Government employees generally." I interpret this to mean that unless we are stimulated by influences outside this Agency to seek more favorable employment advantages for our employees, we will not attempt to do so on our own.

4. I would like to question the whole concept of our ISA Program. From a reading of HR 30-32, it appears that involuntary separation compensation, even when an individual falls within one of the eligible categories, is contingent on what happens to the individual after he leaves the Agency. I believe that any employee who works for the Agency in good faith over a period of years, has earned a respectable involuntary separation allowance even if his job performance becomes substandard or his services are no longer needed. If he has willfully performed below his competence over a period of time, then our real problem is with the supervision that has tolerated such a situation. My point is that if our personnel policies are working efficiently and fairly, a separation program should be a healthy means of keeping our manpower force at optimum efficiency by weeding out promptly and fairly those individuals who do not meet our standards. A fixed separation allowance, it seems to me, would help make it possible to ease out marginal individuals at the earliest time possible instead of paying them salaries year after year for substandard work. Deserving workers, at the same time, could be more quickly promoted to positions of responsibility. I suspect that separation cases not occasionally serve as scapegoats for bad management.

5. I wish to emphasize in the strongest terms that it is the intention of the DCI, the DDCI and myself that this Agency will lead the US Government in favorable employment conditions. Instead of assuring Congress, as is implied in reference memorandum, that we will not seek unusual or superior benefits for our employees, our policy must be to lead the way in getting the very

optimum advantages for our people. What we must assure Congress and others is that, in seeking the best, we can give assurance that CIA is the most efficient manager of its personnel in the US Government. The manpower and budget ceilings under which we must function leave no room for self-imposed mediocrity in any of our activities or policies.

(signed) Lyman B. Kirkpatrick

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick
Executive Director

11/11 9 25 11.83

11/11 9 10 50 11.83

0-001

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM: Acting Deputy Director (Support)
Room 7D-18, Headquarters

NO.

DD/S 63-0926

DATE

6 March 1963

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. Director of Personnel
Room 5E-56, Headquarters

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Emmett:

In the light of Kirk's memorandum, attached, I think you had better have another look at the previous correspondence on this subject, including John Warner's memorandum of 12 February.

Please think about this and let's discuss soon, preferably by Wednesday, 13 March.

HGL

Attachment:

Memo dtd 5 Mar 63 to DD/S
fr Exec Dir, subj: "Involuntary
Separation Allowance"

EA-DD/S:RBF:fp

Distribution:

O - Addressee w/O att

1 - DD/S chrono

1 - DD/S subject w/cc att & back-
ground



SECRET



CONFIDENTIAL

INTERNAL
USE ONLY

UNCLASSIFIED